

**Summary of the Notes taken by Mark S. Rentz  
Regarding the  
PMAC Fall Quarter Meeting  
November 10, 2005**

**Attendance:** 22 PMAC members, 9 Working Group members (6 WG members are also PMAC members). See attendance list at end of these notes.

**NOTE:** The singular purpose of the PMAC's 2005 Fall Quarterly Meeting was to receive and discuss the Pest Management in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Working Group's recommendations.

**1. Director's and Deputy Director's Opening Comments**

**A. Director's Comments**

- Appreciation extended to the Working Group for all its efforts and commitment of time.
- The Working Group was challenged to be visionary in its strategic thinking, i.e. looking forward the next 10-15 years, identifying key policy challenges DPR is likely to face and offering strategic recommendations to address those challenges.
- Working Group was not charged with reviewing and commenting on existing DPR programs though it was free to identify opportunities to modify existing DPR programs to address future policy challenges.
- Direction from the Director to the PMAC:
  - Review the Working Group's recommendations and forward to the Director the entire package or portions PMAC can agree on.
  - Identify priority recommendations.
  - Determine whether public input should be solicited before or after the PMAC forwards the Working Group's recommendations (in part or whole) to the Director.
- The Working Group will sunset unless the PMAC directs otherwise.

**B. Deputy Director's Comments**

- Working Group focused on areas of agreement.
- Working Group identified future challenges for DPR and did not comprehensively review existing DPR programs.
- Working Group identified two broad areas with greatest opportunities for DPR to address future challenges:
  - (1) Expanding DPR's existing Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program.
  - (2) Enhancing DPR's existing Compliance, Education and Enforcement programs.

- Within the two broad areas the Working Group identified three geographic settings for specific recommendations:
  - (1) Agricultural
  - (2) Agricultural-Urban/Residential interface
  - (3) Urban/Residential

**2. Working Group Presentation to the PMAC**

- Working Group member Rick Roush provided an overview of the proposed recommendations to the PMAC. A copy of Rick's powerpoint presentation will be made available to PMAC members.
- The Working Group recommendations are largely voluntary actions as opposed to regulatory measures. Some recommendations do have a regulatory component. These are found mainly within section 2. "Enhance DPR's Compliance, Education and Enforcement Program"

**3. Working Group – PMAC Dialogue (including input from members of the interested public)**

**A. Working Group (WG) process**

- Concern over perceived lack of an analytical approach that clearly identified problems and solutions. WG response: Did make every effort to identify problem/challenge at beginning of each section/subsection and then develop recommendations for DPR to consider. Recommendations are not extremely detailed because group was directed to identify strategic solutions not implementation tactics.
- Need to identify benchmarks and priorities, and then identify obstacles to priorities and whether or not we can overcome those obstacles. WG response: The WG recognized that some benchmarks do exist such as pesticide concentrations in surface water. Regarding priorities, since not all WG members had an opportunity to propose priorities, no priority recommendations were not forwarded to the PMAC. Such discussions were deferred to the PMAC meeting with input from WG.

**PMAC Action**: *The PMAC may want to further identify and discuss priorities and benchmarks to be considered at the 2006 Winter Quarterly meeting (Monday, February 27, 2006)*

**B. DPR's Role**

- Some see DPR's core focus to be enforcement of pesticide regulations and protection of food quality in terms of pesticide residues. Others see DPR has a role in promoting alternative pest management systems and envision an expanded leadership role. WG Response: Identified existing regulatory mandate for DPR to promote pest management in a broader context than pesticide use. See Food and Agriculture Code section 11501(f), "to encourage the development and implementation

of pest management systems, stressing application of biological and cultural pest control techniques with selective pesticides when necessary to achieve acceptable levels of control with the least possible harm to nontarget organisms and the environment.”

- DPR should continue to work in partnership with existing university expertise, extension services and others to address pest management. Growers need to be involved in the partnerships. WG Response: Partnerships recognized in several recommendations. See recommendations under sections 1.A.2. “Limited Resources”; 1.A.4. “Advance an IPM Strategy”; 1.A.4. “Expanded Partnerships”; 1.B.2. “Advance a Statewide Urban Pest Management Strategy”; 1.C.1 “Rapidly Expanding Agriculture-Urban/Residential Interface”.

**C. Expanding DPR’s Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program (Sections 1.A. – 1.D.; 1.B.2.)**

- Some see a need to raise visibility of IPM.
- Concern that recommendations create a perception that industry and growers are not implementing IPM. Any IPM strategy must first identify ongoing IPM efforts and build upon those efforts. See recommendations in sections 1.A.2. “Limited resources”; 1.B.2. “Advance a Statewide Urban Pest Management Strategy”.
- IPM should include pesticide application technology. See recommendations in section 1.A.6. “Pesticide use”.
- Further consideration is needed regarding how to measure IPM success.
- IPM generally is not defined in terms of outcomes. Further consideration is needed regarding how actions of pest managers in both agricultural and urban/residential settings are benchmarked.
- Need further discussion as to incentives and benefits for agriculture and society associated with an expanded an IPM program.
- Questions were raised as to whether DPR (or government) should play a role in marketplace promotion of IPM.

**PMAC Action:** *There is merit for prioritizing an expansion of DPR’s current IPM program. The PMAC proposes consolidating the recommendations set forth in sections 1.A.4. “Advance an IPM Strategy” and 1.B.2. “Advance a Statewide Urban Pest management Strategy” as a priority item. PMAC members will review these recommendations with their constituencies and provide comments to DPR by Monday, January 23, 2006. DPR staff will compile comments and forward them to PMAC members prior to 2006 Winter Quarterly meeting (Monday, February 27, 2006). The PMAC will discuss recommendations and comments at its Winter Quarterly meeting and decide whether to forward recommendations (in part or whole) to Director for her consideration.*

- A concern was raised as to the current PMAC membership if DPR decides to expand its programs in all aspects of urban pest management (pesticide use as well as IPM). It was proposed that DPR, with input from PMAC, consider modifying the current PMAC membership to ensure a more informed discussion regarding urban pest management and consumer product issues.

**PMAC Action:** *No specific action was taken by the PMAC with regards to this recommendation. "Composition of the PMAC" will be an agenda item for the 2006 Winter Quarterly meeting.*

**D. Statewide Voluntary IPM Certification Program (Section 1.E.)**

- Pursue in partnership with others such as California Department of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resource Conservation Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. WG Response: Consistent with discussion under section 1.E.
- Program need not necessarily reside with DPR. WG Response: Consistent with discussion under section 1.E.
- Include an educational component and involve pest control advisers, etc. WG Response: Consistent with recommendations elsewhere in WG paper. See section 1.A.4. "Advance an IPM Strategy".
- Include a communications component that raises the visibility and use of IPM. WG Response: Consistent with recommendations elsewhere in WG paper. See section 1.A.4. "Advance an IPM Strategy".
- Other statewide certification and labeling programs were discussed. For example, the certified organic program is in statute and half the money generated goes to fund "Buy California" program. These efforts need to be explored. Government is involved and all growers benefit, including those growers who adopt the practices and consequently have less regulations. WG Response: Consistent with discussion under section 1.E.

**PMAC Action:** *More work is needed before PMAC can consider whether this should be a priority recommendation for DPR. DPR staff will further develop this recommendation, identifying opportunities to work with other agencies, local government, public interest groups and business interests (agriculture and consumer products) to explore the feasibility of a statewide voluntary IPM certification program. DPR staff will report back to the PMAC at its 2006 Spring Quarterly meeting (Thursday, May 11, 2006). PMAC may consider whether to recommend this as a priority item.*

#### **E. Enhancing DPR's Compliance Education and Enforcement Programs**

- Concern as to whether the Working Group adequately considered recent changes to DPR's enforcement policies and regulations. WG Response: Due to ongoing efforts in the regulatory and legislative arenas at the same time the Working Group was developing its recommendations, there was limited opportunity to incorporate those efforts. DPR's Enforcement Branch chief briefed the Working Group as to recent changes in DPR's enforcement policy, including a shift from a "widget-based" approach to a "performance-based" approach. There was general support amongst the Working Group members for the policy shift.
- Some support the Working Group's recommendations to focus on egregious problems affecting the environment or human health and safety as opposed to paperwork/administrative errors and on recidivist violators.

**PMAC Action:** *More information is needed before the PMAC can consider action on the Working Group's recommendations pertaining to Compliance, Education and Enforcement. The PMAC requested that the appropriate DPR staff review the Working Group's recommendations (sections 2.A.2. "DPR's Enforcement Policy" and 1.B.4. "Retail sales of pesticides") in light of recent DPR policy decisions regarding compliance and enforcement and report back to the PMAC on its findings at the 2006 Winter Quarterly meeting. The PMAC will review the Working Group's recommendations in the context of the DPR briefing.*

#### **F. Remaining Working Group Recommendations**

Several other Working Group issues and associated recommendations were discussed but no action was taken by the PMAC. Due to time constraints, some of the Working Group recommendations were not discussed.

**PMAC Action:** *The PMAC members agreed to review the remaining Working Group recommendations to determine if any additional recommendations should be identified as priority items. Discussion on these issues and recommendations will continue at the next PMAC meeting, time permitting.*

Some of the issues/recommendations discussed without any action by the PMAC included:

- Review DPR's registration and restricted materials permitting processes to ensure adequate initial consideration is given to water quality.

- Review and possibly expand DPR's program applicable to consumer products sales.
- Explore Point-of-Sale information.
- Develop a pest control advisor (PCA) model system that focuses on services including pest monitoring, advice and recommendations.  
***NOTE:** There was a great deal of discussion regarding this issue with no resolution. Several PMAC members expressed an interest in further discussions. The PMAC should revisit this issue and decide whether it wants to consider any further discussions or action.*
- Work with the Structural Control Board and others to develop/promote a pilot IPM certification program for structural pest control.
- New categories of pesticides with DNA as the target site are being developed. DPR needs to work cooperatively with industry and researchers to proactively vet potential effects.
- Expand the landscaper certification program to emphasize IPM.

**PMAC ATTENDEES on November 10, 2005**

Christine Bruhn  
Mark Cady  
Cynthia Cory  
Robert Ehn  
Paul Gosselin  
Karen Heisler  
Anne Katten\*  
Kevin Keefer  
Pam Marrone\*  
Laurie Nelson  
Diana Nisbet  
Maxwell Norton  
Cliff Ohmart\*  
Pete Price  
Karen Ross  
Rick Roush\*  
Mark Shelton  
Rebecca Sisco  
Dave Tamayo\*  
Rick Tomlinson\*  
Mary-Ann Warmerdam  
Barry Wilson

**21<sup>st</sup> Century Working Group (not PMAC Members)**

Robert Liley  
Ron Macedo  
Ann Thrupp

\*also member of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Working Group